



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The next communication presented was by PRESIDENT HENRY E. SHEPHERD (College of Charleston) on

12. *A Study of Lord Macaulay's English.**

[In the absence of the writer, the paper was read by PROFESSOR FELIX E. SCHELLING (University of Pennsylvania).]

Discussion.—PROFESSOR TH. W. HUNT (Princeton College): We have scarcely heard enough of this paper to give us a basis for discussion. Every one is familiar with the writing and the style of MACAULAY and each has his opinion, but enough of the paper has been read to give us its gist and to open the discussion. I do not know that there is any other prominent English prose author so difficult to fix in his proper position as MACAULAY. I do not know that there is one about whom there is so much difference of opinion among intelligent people. I have my own view. We must all admit that MACAULAY is a popular author; his books have been read to a large extent, but popularity is not the only mark of successful authorship. An author may be popular and not occupy a very high position. MACAULAY is a readable author but readableness is not a necessary mark of distinction.

There are two or three distinctive marks of excellence in MACAULAY. One is copiousness of diction. Another distinctive feature of MACAULAY's style is its clearness. Few readers find difficulty in understanding it. This is one great reason that he has been read so much. It is difficult to find in MACAULAY an ambiguous sentence or an involved structure; he is remarkable for his narrative and descriptive style. Few have been so marked by a narrative and descriptive style in conjunction as has MACAULAY. These points must, I think, be conceded with reference to the excellence of MACAULAY.

I wish to emphasize some of the defects in the works of MACAULAY. I have referred to these in a treatise on the subject and have nothing new to offer. I will reiterate the statements there made. Speaking of the copiousness of MACAULAY, I think that he is too copious, he is repetitive. He is what I would call a verbose writer. He tells us too much. He passes beyond the proper point. He states a point more than once and the reader becomes wearied by the repetition of the statement. He lacks condensation. Another radical defect is what I would call excessive word painting, an excess of the graphic style, paying so much attention to portraiture. I think that he carries this to excess, especially in history, for the description of events.—If I were asked what I regarded as the distinctive defect in MACAULAY's style, I should reach it best in this way by stating that I think he had a false theory of what style is. This may strike you as a strange remark. What I mean is this. He emphasizes what DE QUINCY calls the mechanology and does not sufficiently emphasize the organology. He emphasizes the form and does not sufficiently emphasize the thought behind the form. MACAULAY will do anything

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.

to obtain an antithesis. He is bound to secure the antithesis in spite of the thought behind it. What is style? My interpretation is that it is the formulation of, or expression of, a thought for the sake of the thought and not for the sake of the form. In the case of MACAULAY it is the expression not for the sake of the thought but for the sake of the form. I have never received any intellectual impulse from it at all. He is a readable author and in a sense instructive with reference to history. I enjoy reading him, but have never been stimulated mentally by it.

PROFESSOR J. M. HART (University of Cincinnati): In the main I agree with what PROFESSOR HUNT has said, in giving his estimate of MACAULAY. I cannot derive any pleasure, nor I think profit from MACAULAY. I should not assign the same reasons that PROFESSOR HUNT has done. For years I was in the habit of teaching MACAULAY in this way; it consisted in reading MACAULAY's celebrated review of CROFET'S review of BOSWORTH, and then reading CARLYLE'S review of the same book. Nothing will reveal the thinness of MACAULAY'S style more than placing him alongside of CARLYLE. CARLYLE began writing as MACAULAY did. He began as an euphuist, that is he paid more attention to the structure of the sentence and the order of words than to the thoughts themselves. That is he paid attention to the mechanology rather than to the organology. In literature words are organisms. We want not a word, but precisely the word. As has been said there are many ways of doing a thing, but only one way of doing it well. So in a sentence there is only one word that expresses the exact sense. This is where CARLYLE is strong and where MACAULAY is weak.—Another fault with MACAULAY is that he is like super-heated steam. Everything is urged beyond the average. It is not enough for MACAULAY to say of a writer "he is good," "he is poor" or "he is weak," but "he is the best," "he is the worst" or "he is the weakest" writer that he has known. I went over the subject carefully when I was reading CARLYLE and MACAULAY.

I think that the secret lies in this. PROFESSOR HUNT states that MACAULAY had a false view of style. I agree with this, but I should put it differently. I would echo a remark of MATTHEW ARNOLD, who at present seems to be in disfavor. He says of EMERSON that he writes with his eye on the object, while others write with the eye not upon the object, but upon the reader. MACAULAY writes as it were with some one looking over his shoulder saying "How well you have done it."

PROFESSOR H. WOOD (Johns Hopkins University): When I read the title of this paper I expected that an attempt would be made to explain and illustrate MACAULAY by himself. He was evidently not at one with the style of his own age and that would seem to mark him out for special treatment from an analytical stand-point. I was disappointed at not hearing anything of that sort, but perhaps it would have been given in the illustrations. I also missed a reference to some valuable literature upon the subject, as for instance HUME on

MACAULAY. In regard to the explanation of MACAULAY from outside sources, the arguments were not fully stated. His relation to BURKE was not clearly stated. With reference to what has been said in regard to euphuism, no definition was given of that tendency or quality of style and I think that in the present state of knowledge it would be better to omit that term in considering either MACAULAY or CARLYLE. I beg leave to state that the choice of words was a distinctive feature in euphuism because parascenic antithesis was there the marked element. If you have an adjective in one half of the sentence beginning with *p*, you have another adjective or noun beginning with *p* in the other half of the sentence. That led to a most unfortunate choice of words. In this respect, I do not see that properly speaking there is any relation between euphuism and MACAULAY.

PROFESSOR J. M. HART (University of Cincinnati): When I spoke of euphuism and euphuistic, I did not apply the terms with a special significance with regard to the choice of words but I meant to imply that CARLYLE and any good writer uses his words carefully to describe the thought, or to express the object whereas euphuistic writing consists in the use of words and adjectives to jingle with something else. MACAULAY uses words and qualifying terms not because they convey the exact shades of meaning, but because they fit with other words.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM A. HOUGHTON (New York University): It strikes me that we are losing sight of what is due to MACAULAY. I agree with what PROFESSOR PORTER, of Yale College, says: MACAULAY is an excellent author to put into the hands of a young man just beginning the study. In the same line, it may be stated that MATTHEW ARNOLD in discussing MACAULAY says that when people first begin to lead an intellectual life and to feel that they should do something beyond attending to their ordinary every-day business, you will find them buying MACAULAY. In every house in Australia along with Pilgrim's Progress and the Bible, you will find MACAULAY. As to obtaining intellectual stimulus from him, I can say that when young, I found MACAULAY fascinating but I feel that I have out-grown this. I was surprised in listening to the paper not to hear some reference to MACAULAY's indebtedness to DR. JOHNSON. I think that a good deal of his antithetical tendencies is to be traced to that source.

PROFESSOR ALBERT H. SMYTH, of Philadelphia, next followed with a paper on

13. *American Literature in the Class-room.**

Discussion. PROFESSOR A. H. TOLMAN (Ripon College): There is pleasure in listening to an author who makes himself so clear with reference to American literature in the high-school and academy class-room, to American literature in the College class-room and to

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.